

P3 WORKGROUP ON TRAINING

Minutes of the Meetings of July 13th and 14th, 2000

Thursday, July 13th:

Members present at the first meeting were Co-Leader Debra Paddack, OCSE Representatives Nancy Bienia and Pat Pianko, FTB Rep Peter Dosh, County Analyst Pamela Korman, Large County Representative James Martinez, Medium County Representative Mary Liebham, Small County Representative Sharon Quinn, and Judicial Council Representative Michael Wright. Present on behalf of Doris Keller was Michael Coleman of DCSS.

The task presented on Thursday afternoon was to identify the goals of this workgroup, and at least two obstacles that will challenge our ability to reach those goals.

The Goals identified by the group, listed in order of their priority, are as follows:

- Inventory the needs of all who work in the child support program;
- Identify and inventory the large number of in-house training resources which already exist, at the county level, state level, California District Attorneys Association and California Family Support Council.
- Identify HOW to deliver training: how to make training uniform; develop a bank of instructors by topic, and determine desirable, cost- effective methods of delivering training throughout the state.
- Assess the quality of existing training resources; and,
- Determine what are the requirements of the new laws.

The Obstacles identified that would impair our ability to reach our identified Goals are as follows:

LACK of UNIFORMITY between counties: in policies, procedures, practices, forms, business practices and computer systems. This problem is caused by the size of counties and their distance from each other.

COST AND TIME of research are obstacles:

- a) Who will do the surveys?
- b) When and how will the work be done?
- c) Who will pay the cost of the inquiries?
- d) Who will travel the distances to counties?
- e) What support staff resources are needed?

Friday, July 14th:

Members present at today's meetings included everyone named on Thursday's minutes. After lunch Doris Keller and Ann Love joined us, both of DCSS.

In the General Session before the meetings of individual Workgroups, we were directed to develop a work plan for our future meetings. We were invited to describe the SCOPE of our workgroup, and outline an agenda of what we think can be accomplished in four sessions. At the fifth meeting, each group will draft a report for Curt Child of recommendations on policy, regulations or legislation changes which the groups believe ought to be considered.

At the individual Workgroup meeting, the group set forth the following proposed agenda for our meetings:

Session One

1. To List and Prioritize all "Stakeholders" in the Child Support program
[Stakeholders were loosely defined as any individuals or groups who are involved in or benefit from the efficient operation of the Child Support program, and thus would be in need of initial and ongoing training efforts]
2. To Describe the Training Needs of each Stakeholder Group to the best of our abilities.

HOMEWORK for SESSION TWO:

To begin an inventory of the resources already available for training:

Pat Pianko will obtain a list of any federal training materials available.

Mary Liebham will obtain a list of any CDAA and CFSC training materials available.

Michael Wright will survey training materials available at the Judicial Council.

Doris Keller will obtain a list of State training materials available.

Ann Love will find a copy of the SB1410 survey results available by county.

Sharon Quinn will call small counties to identify resources they have available.

Pete Dosh will obtain a list of any FTB resources available for training.

James Martinez will coordinate the list of large county resources available, with assistance, as larger counties have more resources available to devote to training:

Betsy Schmidt will call Los Angeles for training information.

Pete Dosh will call Orange County for information.

James will call San Diego and Riverside for information.

Michael Wright will call both San Mateo and Kern counties.

Mary Liebham will call Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties.

Session Two

Members will share information on available resources.
We will share information on identified needs for training.
The group will write recommendations for future full survey and needs assessment to be performed by the State.

HOMEWORK for SESSION THREE:

Members will survey our own represented groups for their ideas on how they suggest the State should organize and conduct its training programs, especially for the method and frequency of training offered, as well as topics they would like to see taught.

Session Three

Members will brainstorm recommendations for the structure and the mission of the state's future training program. Discussion topics will include:

- 1) an FSS certification program
- 2) a uniform statewide orientation class
- 3) possible certification class for support commissioners and/or family law facilitators
- 4) a glossary of terms
- 5) compiling a training resource directory

Also at Session Three, we will develop homework assignments for Session Four.

Session Four

The Members will formalize training recommendations to DCSS.

This completed a draft outline of our agenda and homework assignments for all four Workgroup Sessions. We decided to begin on the first task of Session One, identifying all "Stakeholders" in the efficient operation of the child support program in California, and prioritizing each category as either short-term or long term. [The terms "short term" and "long term" were used to indicate that we thought a specific group's needs should be addressed immediately ("short term") or that the specific group's needs could be addressed at some unspecified time in the future ("long term").]

STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED:

Short Term Stakeholders (Immediate needs) were identified as follows:

All FSS Caseworkers:

Establishment, enforcement, locate, UIFSA, Intake

FSS Accounting staff

All FSS Clerical and Support staff

FSS Investigators

Family Support Attorneys and paralegals

Court Commissioners, IV-D Court Clerks, and Facilitators

DCSS Staff

Trainers

Advocacy Groups

Long Term Stakeholders (less imperative needs) were identified as follows:

Family Support Supervisors, Managers, and Directors

private attorneys (non-IV-D)

Department of Justice staff

District Attorney Staff (AFTER the transition, when they handle only criminal cases)

Financial Institutions

Employers

Medical Providers

EDD Staff at the Directory of New Hires

IV-A Staff

IV-E Staff (foster care)

Schools

Hospital and Clinic Staff

Other State Agencies (licensing boards, etc)

Community-Based Non-Profit agencies

Faith-based groups

Indian Tribes

A Third Group was identified as having both Short Term and Long Term needs for different types of training on child support issues:

Franchise Tax Board staff

Custodial Parents

Non-Custodial Parents

We discussed generally the different types of training which would be needed by the various groups, in terms of generic (non-specific) training versus specific training – as in job category tasks or computer systems training.

We moved on to categorizing the types of stakeholders into defined groups, and then assigning a priority to the need for, and cost-effectiveness of training for the members of each group.

The Categories were ultimately described as:

PRIORITY ONE: in-house FSD employees

PRIORITY TWO: Outside IV-D Partners (necessary for program performance)

PRIORITY THREE: Other State Agencies (help execute the program)

PRIORITY FOUR: Recipients of IV-D Services (specific “how-to” instructions)

PRIORITY FIVE: General Information (public outreach-type information)

Everyone agreed the Priority One and Two groups had the most urgent need for training, and that groups Three, Four and Five were important, but less imperative in their need for instruction. The Stakeholders listed above were then categorized by priority as follows:

PRIORITY ONE:

FSD Supervisors, Managers, Directors
FSS Caseworkers
FSD Accounting Staff
FSD Clerical and Support Staff
FSD Investigators
IV-D Attorneys
IV-D Paralegals
DCSS State Staff on the Child Support project
Trainers

PRIORITY TWO:

Court Commissioners
Family Law Facilitators
IV-D Court Clerks
Franchise Tax Board staff on the Child Support project
Custodial Parents
Non-Custodial Parents

PRIORITY THREE:

District Attorney Staff training (after the transition)
Department of Justice Staff
EDD Staff at the Directory of New Hires
PRIORITY THREE (Continued):
Other State Agencies involved in support enforcement (DMV, Labor)

IV-A Staff
IV-E Staff
Indian Tribal Groups

PRIORITY FOUR:

Private Attorneys
Financial Institutions
Employers
Medical Providers
Hospital and Clinic Staff
Custodial Parents
Non-Custodial Parents

PRIORITY FIVE:

Indian Tribes
Faith-based Groups
Community-based Non-Profit Agencies
State Agencies (e.g., Head Start)
Schools and Student Groups
Advocacy Groups

Having completed the categorization of individuals and groups in need of training on child support issues, we spent the remaining meeting time “brainstorming” topics for future discussion in greater depth:

A – There needs to be an office-use Internet Policy, which includes the consequences of misuse.

B – There ought to be an Orientation program, which explains in general terms what the child support program does, and what its goals are, especially including the confidentiality requirements.

C – The State needs to compile a “best practices” list for training issues.

D – The State must assess the quality of existing training resources.

E – The State should create a taskforce to assess the quality of existing training programs and blend the best of each class into a uniform product. The taskforce should include staff from state, federal and county levels.

ANCILLARY ISSUES IDENTIFIED throughout the two-session discussion included the following:

1. DCSS needs to decide policy issues uniformly for all counties
2. DCSS should prioritize training needs for
 - a) the child support community
 - b) outsiders
3. All training programs should be evaluated for each separate PRISM system.
4. The issues of Custodial Parent and Non-Custodial Parent education should be referred to the Customer Service and Enforcement P3 Workgroups.
5. The issues of Supervisor and Management training should be referred to the P3 Management Workgroup, for their input and results (best practices, etc.)
6. How will DCSS ensure that training is accurate and uniform, professional and effective?
7. DCSS should put policies and procedures “on-line”, where they will be accessible to all.
8. Define the boundaries between training, public outreach and customer service. Where does one end and the next begin?
9. DCSS should establish task forces on Websites and Distance learning.
10. What will DOJ’s future role be in locate functions of child support?
11. Clarify the integration of delivery of services across state departments (a “customer service” issue).
12. Indian Tribes as child support agencies: how will they fit into the future of child support in California?

July 13/14th MINUTES Respectfully Submitted by SHARON QUINN